

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/774,636	FULLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher RoDee	1756	

All Participants:

(1) Christopher RoDee.

(2) Eugene Palazzo.

Status of Application: ____

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 3 November 2005

Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1,3,14,15,19,22,25,36,38 and 39

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted counsel to request permission to place the pyrolyzation characteristics of Example II in claim 1 to make clear that the polyacrylonitrile is not being heated to such a low temperature or for such a brief time that no change in polymer structure is occurring, or that the process conditions are so severe that a disintegrated powder of carbon results. The Examiner also suggested various editorial amendments, as seen in the Examiner's amendment, to the claims and title. The Examiner also requested permission to insert the limitations of original claim 36 into the specification for proper antecedent basis. Upon discussion, counsel agreed to the amendments.